

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-16 and 18-28 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 14 and 17 were previously cancelled. Claims 27 and 28 are new. As explained further below, Applicant respectfully traverses.

**Claim Amendments**

By this Response, clarifying amendments are made to independent claims 1, 12 and 24. Support for the amendments is provided throughout the application, including at paragraphs [0030], [0041], [0045], [0052] and [0059] of the application as originally filed.

Claims 27 and 28 have been added. Support for these additional claims is provided throughout the application, including at paragraph [0059] of the application as originally filed.

Applicant notes that each and every amendment and argument entered herein is made in view of the particular circumstances surrounding the application at this point in time, and, in view of such circumstances, in the interest of advancing examination of the case. Applicant expressly reserves the right to disclaim any or all such amendments and/or arguments in subsequent prosecution, in the interest of recapturing, upon entry of such disclaimer, any disclaimed claim scope. Applicant respectfully suggests to the Examiner that it may be necessary to, and hereby requests that in fact the Examiner do, revisit and reconsider all art cited against the claims in previous prosecution, in case any amendment made herein re-opens any question of the applicability of such art.

**Statement of Summary of the Interview**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for her time and insight during the interview of January 12, 2011.

During the interview, proposed amendments to claim 1 were discussed. The cited references were also discussed with respect to claim 1. The Examiner suggested that further amendments to the claims relating the alphanumeric input to the component to compose a destination may help to clarify the claimed subject matter. No agreement was reached.

Again, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for her time and insight.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15, 16 and 18-24 stand rejected having regard to of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,796 to Siitonen et al. (“Siitonen”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,950,988 to Hawkins et al. (“Hawkins”), in view of U.S Publication No. 2004/0155908 to Wagner (“Wagner”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,295,852 to Davis et al. (“Davis”).

Independent claim 1 recites: “wherein the at least one component to compose a destination for a respective one of the at least two communication capabilities is invokable from the main screen via selection of the application icon for the respective communication capability and is also invokable in response to an alphanumeric input from the first input device of a portion of the destination, the component to compose a destination being invoked depending on the type of alphanumeric input.” Independent claims 12 and 24 recite similar features.

The present claims describe a main screen from which different communication capabilities may be invoked. In particular, the composition component for different communication capabilities can be invoked from the main screen using two different methods: i) by selecting the icon for the respective communication capability; or ii) by inputting an alphanumeric character. The claims describe where both options for invoking the composition component are simultaneously available from the main screen.

The claims also describe where the specific composition component that is invoked is dependent on the type of alphanumeric input. For example, input of a portion of a telephone number (e.g., a numeric input) may invoke a composition component for a telephone communication capability, while input of a portion of an email address (e.g., an alphabetic input) may invoke a composition component for an email communication capability.

In contrast, the cited references only teach invoking the composition component using one method. The Office Action (page 4) cites Hawkins as teaching that the component to compose a destination is invokable from the home screen in response to input from the key-based input device of a portion of the destination (Fig. 6B, column 19 lines 42-48). The cited passage and figure shows a user using input of the letter “B” to filter contacts using a contact

screen. However, there is no icon selectable to invoke a dialling component. This is because the user is already at the dialling component, not the main screen.

The Office Action (page 5) admits that Siitonen, Hawkins and Wagner do not disclose that the component to compose the destination is invokable from the home screen manually by activating a communication application icon, but relies on Davis to teach this (column 6, lines 47-55). The cited passage describes selection of a “conference” icon to set up a conference call, but there is no way by which alphanumeric input invokes a dialling component.

Thus, none of the cited references provide for both an option to invoke the composition component by selecting an icon simultaneously with an option to invoke the composition component by inputting alphanumeric input, from the main screen.

As well, none of the cited references teach or suggest the claimed feature: the “component to compose a destination being invoked depending on the type of alphanumeric input.” For example, in Hawkins, the user is already in the dialling component for making a telephone call. Regardless of the type of alphanumeric input entered by the user, a telephone number will be dialled. Siitonen, Wagner and Davis are also silent regarding at least this feature of the claims.

Therefore, the features of the present independent claims are not all found in Siitonen, Hawkins, Wagner and Davis, whether taken alone or in combination. The Applicant submits that the independent claims, and the remaining claims which are dependent therefrom, are all patentable over the cited references.

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

### CONCLUSION

The Applicant believes that it has responded to each ground of rejection raised by the Examiner, and that for at least the reasons cited above the claims, as presented, are in condition for immediate allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims.

The Applicant is concerned to advance this application as quickly as is reasonably possible. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that, in the event the Examiner has any further questions about this application, the Examiner call the Applicant's attorney at the number provided below.

The Applicant believes that no further fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper. In the event that the office determines that any further fee is due, the Applicant requests that such fee be charged to its Deposit Account No. 195113.

The Applicant requests that any questions concerning this matter be directed to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**OGILVY RENAULT LLP**

Date: February 4, 2011

By: \_\_\_\_\_/cyw/  
Christine Wong  
Registration No. 62,935  
Tel: (416) 216-1874  
Fax: (416) 216-3930

OGILVY RENAULT LLP  
Suite 3800, Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower  
200 Bay Street, P.O. Box 84  
Toronto, ON M5J 2Z4  
Canada